

I wish everyone were here because I had intended to tell a couple of jokes in the absence of objection on the part of the Chairman and with this small number here, although we have a quorum, a joke might fall flat on its face so early in the day. I shall attempt it, nevertheless, in the light of some jokes that have been told. This one deals with farmers. It seems two motorists driving along the highway observed a farmer plowing, and they made a bet with each other. One bet the other \$20 that the farmer could guess his age. They went over and approached the farmer and asked him if he could guess the age of one of the motorists, the one in question. The farmer looked at him and told him, "that is easy. You are forty-four years old." So the man said, "how did you guess?" He said, "well, I have a son who is twenty-two and he is half crazy."

*(Laughter.)*

Maybe another farm joke is in order since I possibly shall not use all of my controlled time on this question. It seems that one farmer sold a mule to another farmer. I am a country boy too. I came from the Magnolia State before I came this far north—the State of Mississippi, for those of you who do not know. It was stated by the farmer who made the sale that the only thing necessary in order to get the best results on the part of this mule was to feed him well, curry him, and be kind to him. The farmer who made the purchase did all these things. After several days, he decided to put the mule to work. He hitched him up to a plow and, of course, those of you who have been on the farm know, he told him to get up. He said this to him several times but the mule stood pat. In fact, that mule stood as pat as some of the delegates I met at this fine Convention. After a few moments he decided he made a bad purchase. He went to his neighbor and said, "give me my money back, take the mule back." The neighbor said, "no, he is a good mule, let's go see what is wrong with him." He went over and he reached down and grabbed a two-by-four piece of wood and he hit the mule between his eyes, and told the other farmer, now go over there and say get up. He went over, said get up, and the mule moved off. He said this is a good mule but before you can get him to do anything you have to get his attention. Maybe I have your attention by this time.

First, I shall read to you from a report which you have on your desk. The minority strongly recommends that municipal cor-

porations be denied the right to discriminate on account of property ownership, extending the right to vote to non-residents. The majority attempts to distinguish between resident property ownership as a qualification, and nonresident property ownership. The minority contends that the practice of nonresident property ownership is the same in theory. It is nothing less than the eighteenth century rotten borough in modern dress.

It would be the only legal method of buying votes. There can be no doubt that property qualifications for voting have existed for centuries. There were property qualifications for voting in most of the states of the United States at the time of the Constitutional Convention and for some time thereafter. Property qualifications, however, are relics of a bygone pre-democratic era when the landed gentry and the wealthy classes were attempting to maintain a restrictive franchise. The history of the property franchise reveals very clearly that this was based upon the notion that only those who owned land had a stake in the society. The minority does not wish to debate whether this idea has had any basis in fact at the time. It does wish to emphasize two major points: one, economic considerations for property qualifications have no place in a largely democratic society and, two, real estate, without question, no longer is considered the basis of one's stake in society.

It has been argued that it would be very bad for certain communities if property owners who did not live in the community were denied the vote. Mr. Marcus Williams, Solicitor of Ocean City, in response to a question stated the following: "I do not think there is any difference or any competition or conflict or clash whatsoever between residents and non-residents. We are all together, whether we live there or not. I do not think the elections would be changed."

It should be noted that Ocean City permits corporations to vote in municipal elections as well. The minority agrees with Mr. Williams, that the residents of Ocean City share the values of the non-resident property owners. It is obvious that the residents are at least partially dependent economically upon the non-resident property owners and would exercise the franchise with that relationship in mind. At present only a few resort communities avail themselves of this provision, but have we seen the municipalities of the future? If Columbia or some other new town were to become a